

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 4-8 are amended and Claim 9 is cancelled by the present amendment.

Claim amendments and new claims find support in the application as originally filed at least at page 50, line 18-22. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bayer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,311,190, herein “Bayer”) in view of Kalpio et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,323, herein “Kalpio”); and Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Bayer and Kalpio in view of Greenfield (U.S. Pat. No. 6,748,528).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 4 is directed to an information providing method that includes, in part, recording, receiving, selecting, generating and transmitting steps. A third receiving step includes receiving, at a key server, user terminal identification from a user terminal used by a user. A generating step includes generating a key based on the user terminal identification to manage downloaded content from the content server. A second transmission step includes transmitting, from the key server, the key and the target destination of said contents server which enables the user terminal used by said user to download contents from said contents server. Independent Claims 1 and 5-8 include similar features.

In a non-limiting example, Applicants’ Fig. 1 shows an information providing system having a registration server 3 that receives from the user terminal 1 a) a request for transmission of the user registration form data and b) user terminal identification data specifying said user terminal as an argument of a target destination of the registration server said attributes input by said user. The registration server 3 selects the registration form data

based on the attributes received by said first receiving step. The user registration form data, as illustrated in Figs. 8 and 9, is transmitted and recorded in the user terminal 1. The registration server 3 receives a user profile based on what is input on the form and records the profile data and the terminal identification data in the user terminal 1. Finally, the key server 5 receives the user terminal identification and generates a key based on the user terminal identification. Once this is accomplished, the target destination of the contents server (4-1 through 4-4), in the form of a URL, back to the user terminal 1 allowing the user to download content. Additionally, the key server sends a key based on the user terminal identification data specifying of the user terminal used by the user, allowing the user to manage the downloaded content. Claims 6-8 include similar features but directed to a user terminal.

In the response, Applicants have cancelled Claim 9 and incorporated the features found therein into the independent claims.

The outstanding Office Action, states on page 9, item 20, that Bayer and Kalpio “did not specifically teach an authenticating key.” Thus, the outstanding Office Action cites Greenfield as curing the deficiencies of Bayer and Kalpio.

Greenfield discloses systems and methods for allowing secure authentication in SSL systems.¹ Further, Greenfield discloses a public key.² However, Greenfield does not describe or suggest generating a key based on user terminal identification data.

In other words, Greenfield discloses a public key which is unique but is not generated based on specific information. In contrast the independent claims describe generating a key based on user terminal identification data, where the user terminal identification data includes data specifying the user terminal used by the user. Further, in contrast to Greenfield, the independent claims recite that the key is used to manage downloaded content from the content server.

¹ Greenfield, Col. 2, lines 45-50.

² Greenfield, Col. 6, lines 7-14 and Col. 7, lines 45-53.

Additionally, Kalpio and Bayer do not cure the above noted deficiencies of Greenfield with regard to generating a key based on user terminal identification data and using a key to manage downloaded content.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 and consequently independent Claims 1 and 4-8 patentably distinguish over Kalpio, Bayer, and Greenfield considered alone or together in any proper combination.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1 and 4-8, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719